



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/707,720	11/07/2000	Yasuhiro Takada	450100-02835	9803

20999 7590 06/21/2004

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

LONSBERRY, HUNTER B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2004

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/707,720

Applicant(s)

TAKADA ET AL.

Examiner

Hunter B. Lonsberry

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,665,020 to Stahl in view of U.S. Patent 6,237,049 to Ludtke.

Regarding claims 1, 4, and 6, Stahl discloses an IEEE 1394 network in which remote control commands are received by a DTV 14, as DTV 14 can not perform the associated command, the associated command is relayed to a device which can perform a command, such as a channel up or down command, or play command (column 3, line 41-column 4, line 4, column 8, lines 1-27, column 9, line 21-column 10, line 11).

Stahl fails to disclose transmitting a notification from a first device to a second device to mount a connection management function from a plurality of connection management functions, including a command set needed to manage data transmission between the transmitting device and the receiving device.

Ludtke discloses a method in which devices on an IEEE 1394 may act as a proxy for another device on the network; this device may also act as a device translator to enable communications between devices, which utilize different communications languages (column 6, lines 25-65, column 7, line 61-column 8, line 9, line 56-column 9, line 32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Stahl to utilize the proxy and device translation features of Ludtke to enable communications between IEEE 1394 compliant and non-compliant devices.

Regarding claim 2, Stahl discloses an IEEE1394 network which routes commands to devices on the network, transaction layer 22 and IRM 26 allocate and de-allocate isochronous resources, such as channels and bandwidth (column 3, line 41-column 4, line 29).

Regarding claims 3 and 7, Stahl discloses an IEEE 1394 network in which remote control commands are received by a DTV 14, as DTV 14 can not perform the associated command, the associated command is relayed to a device which can perform a command, such as DVCR 12 such as a channel up or down command, or play command, which would result in programming being displayed on DTV 14 (column 3, line 41-column 4, line 4, column 8, lines 1-27, column 9, line 21-column 10, line 11).

Regarding claim 5, Stahl discloses an IEEE1394 network which routes commands to devices on the network, transaction layer 22 and IRM 26 allocate and de-

allocate isochronous resources, such as channels and bandwidth (column 3, line 41-column 4, line 29).

Regarding claims 8 and 9, Stahl discloses an IEEE1394 network, which routes commands to devices on the network.

Stahl and Ludtke do not disclose the use of self-identifying data, which includes a device type.

The examiner takes official notice that the use of self-identifying data stored in each device on an IEEE 1394 network, which identifies the device, and its device type is well known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Stahl and Ludtke to utilize self identifying data including device type so that each device can identify it self during the set up process and addresses and capabilities of the devices on the network can be determined.

Regarding claim 10, Stahl discloses an IEEE1394 network, which routes commands to devices on the network.

Stahl and Ludtke do not disclose the use of override DCMs.

The examiner takes official notice that the use of override DCMs in an IEEE 1394/HAVi network to add additional functionality to a device is well known in the art,

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Stahl and Ludtke to utilize override DCMs in order to add further functionality to a device beyond the standard command set.

Regarding claim 11, Stahl discloses an IEEE1394 network, which routes commands to devices on the network.

Stahl and Ludtke do not disclose graphical icons, which represent the transmitting and receiving device.

The examiner takes official notice that the use of icons to represent devices on a network is well known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Stahl and Ludtke to utilize icons representing the transmitting and receiving devices in order to provide a user with an easily navigable interface to control the devices on the network.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent 6,591,419 to Barry: Digital Multi-media Device and Method Relating Thereto.

U.S. Patent 6,567,032 to Mulla: Method of Directing Communication Between Addressable Targets Using a Generalized Pointing Device.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hunter B. Lonsberry whose telephone number is 703-305-3234. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday during normal business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on 703-305-4380. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/707,720
Art Unit: 2611

Page 7

HBL



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER